

REMARKS

Initially, applicant thanks Examiner Vanaman for courtesy he extended during a telephone call of November 14, 2006 and subsequent interview of December 11, 2006. Applicant sent an informal draft of the present amendment to the Examiner via fax on November 20, 2006, and requested review of same. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that he had reviewed the informal draft amendment. However, no agreement was reached.

Nonetheless, during the interview, the Examiner suggested amending independent claim 1 by incorporating allowable subject matter of claim 5, to readily place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, in this present amendment, applicant has followed the Examiner's suggestions – by amending claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 5 – to place the application in condition for allowance.

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-4 and 6-18 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 9 and 16 are independent. Claims 9-17 are withdrawn from consideration since they are directed to a non-elected invention. Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating allowable subject matter of claim 5 (now cancelled) therein. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice and without abandonment or dedication of the subject matter thereof.

The above-identified Office Action has been reviewed, the references carefully considered, and the Examiner's comments carefully weighed. In view thereof, the present Amendment-B is submitted. It is contended that by the present amendment and arguments, all bases of objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action have been traversed and overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Amendments:

In the claims: as noted above, claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the allowable subject matter of claim 5, to specify that the front cover kit further comprises a pair of stays, wherein a respective stay is adapted for placement extending backward from each of the right and left sides of the headlight; wherein the stays are attachable to the body frame, and wherein the left shroud and the right shroud are attachable to the respective stays.

In the specification: a paragraph [033] of the specification has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure including the drawings, and that no new matter is introduced into the application by amending the claims and specification, since all of the subject matter thereof was expressly or inherently disclosed in the specification, claims and drawings, as originally filed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

1. In the Office Action (item 3, page 2), the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoru et al. (JP 03-109185) in view of Nakamura (US 6,820,708).

Applicant's response:

As stated above, applicant has amended independent claim 1 by incorporating allowable subject matter of claim 5. Upon careful consideration and in light of the above amendments, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 18; and respectfully submits that the rejection is overcome, and that each of claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 18 is patentably distinct over the disclosures of Satoru et al. and Nakamura, considered either singly or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the total combination of each of claims 1- 4, 7, 8 and 18 is not taught/disclosed by the applied references for the reasons provided in the previously filed Amendment-A of July 18, 2006.

However, in order to expedite the prosecution of the application and place the application in condition for allowance, applicant has amended claim 1 – at the suggestion of the Examiner – by incorporating allowable subject matter of claim 5 therein.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Each of claims 2- 4, 7, 8 and 18, which directly or indirectly depend from claim 1, is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

For all of the foregoing reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1- 4, 7, 8 and 18 under 35 USC §103(a).

2. In the Office Action (item 4, page 3), the Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoru et al. in view of Nakamura and Kuji (US 6,622,666).

Applicant's response:

Upon careful consideration and in light of the above amendments, applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claim 6; and respectfully submits that the rejection is overcome, and that claim 6 patentably distinct over the applied references for the reasons provided in the previously filed Amendment-A of July 18, 2006, in relation to deficiencies of Satoru et al. and Kuji which are not overcome by additional teachings of Nakamura.

Moreover, claim 6 is believed to be in condition for allowance because it directly depends from amended claim 1 which includes allowable subject matter.

For all of the foregoing reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

At item 5 of the Office Action (page 4), the Examiner indicated that claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's response:

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of the allowable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

Based on all of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action are overcome, and that as presently amended, all of the pending claims are believed to be allowable over all of the references of record, whether considered singly or in combination.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of record, and allowance of the pending claims.

Entry of the present Amendment-B is respectfully requested under 37 CFR §1.116 on the grounds that: the amendment does not raise any new issues for consideration by the Examiner, but instead merely adopts the suggestions of the Examiner as discussed during the interview of December 11, 2006, by amending claims to include allowable subject matter and therefore, the present amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner is not fully convinced of all of the claims now in the application, applicant respectfully requests that he telephonically contact applicant's undersigned representative to expeditiously resolve prosecution of the application.

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No. 21828
Carrier, Blackman & Associates, P.C.
24101 Novi Road, Suite 100
Novi, Michigan 48375
January 8, 2007

Joseph P. Carrier
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,748
(248) 344-4422

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted, via EFS-Web, to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, on January 8, 2007.



JPC/fs